

Rogue Scholar keeps challenging the functionality of my blog

Egon Willighagen 

Published August 23, 2026

Citation

Willighagen, E. (n.d.). In *chem-bla-ics*. chem-bla-ics. <https://doi.org/10.59350/ezrsn-psn52>

Keywords

Blog, Cito, Json

Copyright

Copyright © Egon Willighagen 2026. Distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Rogue Scholar continues to offer [awesome features](#). It seems the recent move to InvenioRDM (14.0 was just released) was a good one. It does require rewrites, but make things more scalable. One thing that did exist in the InvenioRDM-based Rogue Scholar last year was [citations to blog posts](#). But even that was [redeveloped and relaunched](#) a few days ago. It does not have yet the same amount of citations to blog posts as before, but [more than 1200 can be found again](#).

Platforms are getting more better at precisely capturing how we communicate science. Rogue Scholar is a great example of that, like the no longer existing [CiteULike](#) before. And Rogue Scholar has been challenging my Markdown-based blog post to support its functionality. For example, I had to [add a JSON Feed](#), but also was happy that [Rogue Scholar added CiTO Support](#).

But capturing all citations between things remains an issue. Platforms like Google Scholar and Web of Science do their best, but their best is not Open or nor FAIR or neither. Generally, it has taken way too long for [DataCite](#) and [Software Citations](#) to be picked up. However, we can [take control ourselves](#) when solutions do not exist.

And because I want journal-to-blog citations are FAIR too, I hacked up another extension of my blog today. I can now add lines like this to the metadata of blog post:

cited-in: cito:discusses:10.1186/1471-2105-8-487

What is encoded is that the article with doi:[10.1186/1471-2105-8-487](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-8-487) (one of my own) discusses [one of the posts in my blog](#).

Online, this is rendered with [citation.js](#) like this:

Additionally, any relevant, recent literature recommendations are most welcomed. I am aware of the use of polynomials, but literature I have seen so far just focuses on molecules of a certain architecture, and it not able to come up with a guess based on the molecular formula alone.

This post was originally posted as https://chem-bla-ics.blogspot.com/2006/12/counting-stereoisomers-from-molecular_17.html.

References

- McKay, B. D., Yirik, M. A., & Steinbeck, C. (2022). Surge: a fast open-source chemical graph generator. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13321-022-00604-9> [CrossRef Scholia](#)
- Yirik, M. A., Sorokina, M., & Steinbeck, C. (2021). MAYGEN: an open-source chemical structure generator for constitutional isomers based on the orderly generation principle. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13321-021-00529-9> [CrossRef Scholia](#)

Cited in

- Willighagen, E. L., O'Boyle, N. M., Gopalakrishnan, H., Jiao, D., Guha, R., Steinbeck, C., & Wild, D. J. (2007). Userscripts for the Life Sciences. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-8-487> [\[cito:discusses\] CrossRef Scholia](#)

Here, the *References* are the things I cite in my blog post, and the *Cited in* are things citing this blog post.

How blog posts are cited

Now, DOIs for blog posts are a new thing: they did not exist when I started blogging. And for the 12 citations I found so far, they are not using a DOI. I doubt that these citations are easily found in CrossRef or DataCite. Here are two examples, of increasing complexity. The first one is how many citation styles would do it:

7. Willighagen EL, CiTO/CiteULike: publishing innovation, 2012, chem-bla-ics, <https://chem-bla-ics.blogspot.com/2012/02/cito-citeulike-publishing-innovation.html>

But they can also look like this:

52. Counting consitutional isomers from the molecular formula[http://chem-bla-ics.blogspot.com/2006/12/counting-stereoisomers-from-molecular_17.html]

And scientific journals sometimes even use URL shorteners and then it may look like this:

PubMed). Meanwhile, Egon Willighagen at Chem-bla-ics, makes budding programmers aware (<http://go.nature.com/KzcR2U>) of the Royal Society of Chemistry's efforts to

This makes it a challenge for any platform to pick up these citations!

How about the JSON Feed

That leaves me with how I make this information available, a bit towards FAIR, but at least machine readable. This is done with a [JSON Feed extension](#) (at the time of writing, I did not add this proposal yet). My `archive.json` feed now contains 12 fragments like this:

```
"_citations": [  
  {  
    "url": "https://doi.org/10.1038/nchem.2187",  
    "doi": "10.1038/nchem.2187",  
    "cito": [  
      "citesForInformation"  
    ]  
  }  
]
```

It matches the structure of the [_references extension](#).

chem-bla-ics

Let's see where this goes :)